

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 remain pending in this application, with claims 1, 9, 14 and 24 being independent. Claims 14 and 26 have been amended in response to the Examiner's 35 USC 112 rejection.

Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 18-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,784,590 (Cohen). Applicant respectfully traverses.

According to the Examiner, Cohen teaches each and every element recited in the rejected claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nowhere does Cohen teach or suggest a decoder to access first and second entries of the tag array responsive to a request. The Examiner refers to Col. 7, lines 26-33 of Cohen to show the teaching of a decoder. However, Col 7, lines 26-33 fails to teach or even suggest a decoder. For these and other reasons Applicants respectfully traverses Examiner's rejection of these claims under Cohen.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,623,627 (Witt). Applicant respectfully traverses.

According to the Examiner, Witt teaches each and every element recited in the rejected claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nowhere does Witt teach or suggest a decoder or hit/miss logic. The Examiner refers to Fig. 3A to show that the hit/miss logic is shown by the flowchart of Fig. 3A. Witt fails to show or suggest the hit/miss logic of the present application. Furthermore, Will fails to teach or suggest a decoder. The Examiner refers to step 515 and 525, both of which refer to the first and second access according to the examiner. However, there is no decoder in Witt. For these and other reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses rejection of these claims.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,752,263 (Kranich). Applicant respectfully traverses.

-According to the Examiner, Kranich teaches each and every element recited in the rejected claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nowhere does Kranich teach or suggest a decoder. The Examiner refers to elements 90 and 110 of Fig. 2 and elements 150, 156 of Fig. 3 to show the decoder. However, these elements disclose a cache lookup

and accessing tag arrays. Kranich does not teach or suggest a decoder to access first and second entries. For these and other reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims.

Claims 14-23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kranich, in view of, U.S. Patent No. 6,490,660 (Gilda). Applicant respectfully traverses for the same reasons as those discussed above with respect to Kranich.

In summary, for the reasons noted above, Claims 1-26 are distinguished over the cited art and are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Favorable action is respectfully solicited. Allowance of the Claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional charges to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 8, 2004



Ami P. Shah  
Registration No. 42,143

c/o Intel Americas  
LF3  
4030 Lafayette Center Drive  
Chantilly, VA 20151  
(703) 633-6868